

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIE ROYCE WILLIAMS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
F. BRYANT,  
Defendant.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01293-JDP (PC)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

RESPONSE DUE WITHIN TWENTY-ONE  
DAYS

On August 2, 2024, defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 33. To date, plaintiff has not filed a response.


To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet certain deadlines. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to comply with its orders or local rules. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

I will give plaintiff a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss the case for his failure to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant's motion. Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order and will result

1 in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show  
2 cause within twenty-one days why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and  
3 failure to comply with local rules. Should plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall  
4 file, within twenty-one days, an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant's motion.

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7  
8 Dated: October 10, 2024

  
9 JEREMY D. PETERSON  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28